M-1069 (1) Berkeley Mon Nov 7 1966

(Schedule information)...So, time is getting a little shorter, & maybe with that a little bit of an urgency that you try to get some of the questions formulated for yourself. When I listen to your tapes I still get the idea that some of you are quite woozy about Work. And then of course you want to interpret many things in your own way, etc. It is a little stupid to do that. It is a language that exists & you might say G. has taken simply for the reason that & particularly you might object to some of the strange words in it. It is simply because the language as we have it has so many different connotations that it is difficult to convey what is really meant because your own bringing up always looks at a certain term in a certain way dependent on the associations you have for it. And the whole idea is that you try to get certain concepts so clear that there is no mistake about it & you don't have to argue. Now if you want to substitute something that has a certain appeal for you it doesn't have that same appeal for someone else; the point is to try to establish a common language that everybody understands, so that it is not a Tower of Babel, but that it is actually something that is a language among us who are interested in Objectivity as it has been described by G., who has used certain words for certain purposes. That is a very simple statement; if you learn mathematics, you surely will have to use the terminology that belongs to mathematics--you're not going to improve on it by using your own words. (?When) the difficulty of understanding a concept as represented by words, then you can ask questions - what is meant by it - but in your own privacy when you want to use other words for it, it is all right, but don't use them here. In the end, I think you'll have to come to the conclusion that there is only one particular language that indicates what is meant by "Objectivity", or what is meant by "Awareness" or "Awake", & "State of Self-consciousness"; "Self-Remembering"--all these terms have to be defined so that you understand them for yourself, even if you don't know what it means in practice, that at least you know that when you use a word you can be understood by someone else.

Now, what particular subjects are there that you still would like to have some clarification in?

Definition of the word "Self-remembering" & its relation to Self-Observation; & concerning the statement that we are engaged in some kind of Work on all 3 centers simultaneously, as the 4th Way- elucidation.

Self-Remembering & Self-Observation. Once I made a distinction between self with a capital & small s. When one "remembers", it is already the wrong word. Remembering is a mental function. When it is used with self-remembering, it has to do with possibly two things: I remember something of myself which at the present time is not apparent anymore, but I want to remember it because it was of value. In that particular formulation, S is a capital. It means that what I was when I was a little child & what was then myself, that I wish to remember it — how it was. If I want to describe how I was as a little child, what kind of a self I had, I have to say that it was unspoiled, uninhibited; that it was born & appeared in this world pure; & that as yet, as G. would say, it has not been written on, & the paper has not as yet been dirtied. With other words, that which is represented by a young child as a beginning of its life on earth, is not yet affected by the conditions of life on earth; & it still has a quality which really makes it alive, of a kind of existence which is different from an earthly existence; the assumption being that as a child starts to live on earth, it gradually is affected by the conditions of earth, & that as a result, he will be conditioned & also will make adjustments to whatever the conditions of earth are that he will have to experience; & that because of that, this Self, which is first with a capital S, now becomes a small self, simply indicating that the relationship of that which is as a child is different from a person all grown up, and if we now use the self-remembering in that sense with a small s, that the remembering has also a different connotation. When I now wish, in that way, that what I am at the present time as a grown-upperson, with a spoiled Self or a covered one, that I wish to remember that, I think we use my memory of that which has been as a steppingstone for Self-observation. So self-remembering means that I try to remember myself as I am now, in

what I have done, what I have thought & what I have felt. Self-remembering in this sense does not mean anything more than gathering of data, or that which belongs to a certain form of alertness of becoming acquainted with myself, & it is very simple for an ordinary self study. To some extent it is an alertness, because I cannot look at myself without particularly in retrospect --- seeing what it was I am most likely to criticize it, or at least describe it; but in any event, I remember now what has been an experience of myself which has affected me, & in that self-remembering I accumulate certain data about myself, which I say, "that was me", or, "That was the experience I had". Self-observation now enters particularly at that point while I consider that what I am, myself as a grown-up person, I want to make sure that that which is my observation is correct & that that what I consider the data about myself as a result of self-remembering, that I want to check it; I want to make sure, now, that that what I have received as an impression of myself is really the truth. Self-remembering will not give that, but Self-observation can give that if it is carried out correctly; because then into the alertness is introduced something that I call an Impartiality, which then makes the alertness go over into an Awareness. So self-observation then becomes the next step after self-remembering. If self-observation is carried out well, the self in that now becomes with a capital S. But for that, the observation has to becorrect, & it is not a true observation unless it is impartially carried out; & if I understand impartially well enough, I know that I cannot afford any thinking process in connection with it, & because of that, that which has to be observed has to be observed at the moment when it happens, because only by having my observation extended only for one moment, & not before & not after the moment, & not being influenced by the mental functions of my mind (which is only interested in that which I can remember) & that which I can anticipate), then out of this 3-fold reason for wanting to Work, I now take Observation of myself in its complete sense & it includes, then impartiality & simultaneity.

Now the question of the simultaneous development of the 3 centers. I think it has to be understood a little differently than perhaps you think. I start by trying to become

observant to the manifestations of my body. I call that, simply, an observation of the physical center, & the reason for it is quite obvious; because if Observation has to be impartial, I don't want to have the interference of any feeling or emotional center entering into that kind of observation. Impartiality means that that is excluded, that I'm not partial, & I only can be impartial when I don't have a feeling. Impartiality simply means a certain basis of feeling about something in a certain way. The reason why I don't want to start observing my mental functions, thought process or whatever takes place in my brain, is that I am interested in simultaneity, & as soon as I try to become observant of something that is mental in its origin &mental in its particular function, but which mentality will not allow a moment of existence to be registered, then I will have difficulty if I want to observe such a thing when it has to answer to the purpose of simultaneity-- or really, that that has to be a requirement. So I say that it is obvious that I start with manifestations of the physical body, because in that, there is very little feeling, & there is very little possibility of a thought interfering with it. I make it easier for the functions of whatever might be as "I" trying to become observant not to be interfered with by anything that has to do with the object itself, so that the object is more or less free from feeling, & more or less free from a thought so that then I can at least hope for a little better success in trying to become observant to my behavior in a physical sense. Now what will happen if we are to become observant to this? It simply means that there is something registered in my mind,-- or in that part of my mind which I like to call "the possibility of an objective development", or whatever may be that kind of a function---that simply it is recording certain facts about myself, in statements, without explaining it, & without having any particular wish connected to it. But that which is mybehavior is a result in me of that which I have felt or what I have thought; so it is quite obvious that if I study this kind of behavior in this sense of observing, that then I will be able to trace, at times, the source of why the behavior form is the way it is; & with this continued observation, I will be able to go up the line to the source, &

reach my feeling, & reach also the thought process. You see, I am not so dumb about that because I know well enough by ordinary experience what has caused the behavior. I know that when I am angry I express; I know when I have a thought that has to be expressed in activity, I know that when that activity is there, then of course I know that I had a thought about it. If I give a command to my legs to walk, I know that it was in my mind first - that I had a thought of wanting to walk & then my legs started to walk because they got an order. So now whenever I observe my walking, I know it has come from my mind. For that reason, when I say I can become observant of that which is physical behavior, I already start to include the possibility of the source material-- that where it originally came from--& if I have learned well enough how to become impartial or observe correctly, I can extend it to the source, & in that way you might say when I observe I change the object--instead of the physical object, it is now my feeling center, & it may also be my mind.

Now there is another way of looking at it: I am interested in the development of myself as a total personality. That is, the aim according to G. is to become a man; & man is defined as some kind of an entity which has 3 different functions to fulfill on earth. One is his physical body, the other is his feeling center & the other is his mind; & all 3 apparently are necessary for making a personality because that happens to be Man as he is, different from an animal or a plant. And if I say that man is three centered--merely meaning that that which he represents in his different manifestations is called by certain states as a result of what he feels & thinks-- then his behavior, & partly the behavior form of his body (maybe because of certain desires on the part of the body itself).. but nevertheless, there are the 3 centers, & I now wish in some way or other to develop them. I.e., the assumption has to be made that if man is not as he is supposed to be, that there is something lacking; & if that lacking could be supplied, the result would be an Harmonious Man. And in this way I express harmony as a relationship between the 3 centers so that they are balanced & can stand on their own feet, & can be connected or combined at will, whenever it is necessary to have a little bit of this & a little bit of the other & a little bit of

M1069

the 3rd one. Now, if you look at it that way, the question is Is man so impossible as he seems to be indicated; i,e, is man really so completely connected in his centers that whenever one is touched the otherwill necessarily have to do something about it also? In other words, is the connection between the centers constantly for a personality such that they cannot function as separate independently? This is againma question of gathering data about oneself; & many times when I think, it may be translated into an activity--but also, when I am in the activity, my mind will constantly try to direct. Whenever I have a feeling, the expression of my feeling is only possible through a certain condition of my body. And whenever I know that something happens to me in any one of the three centers the other 2 centers will always come, partly to help & partly to interfere. Now if this is actually the condition of Man, then the question is what should he do about it, or what aught to be done in order to make a man harmonious?--- if that is the aim. We call it simply the 4th Way. The other 3 ways are indicated by the development of each center to its greatest possible development; & as you know, fakir, mônk & yogi are simply a few wordswords indicating a development in that sense of only physical, only emotional, only intellectual; which will then give a man a certain ability expressed primarily in that one center, but maybe at the cost of the other centers or at any event not sufficiently developed, so that such a man as a fakir or a wrestler can not be called harmonious as a man. It is a question of definition, of course, what is understood by "man", & it is also a question of what is really the aim of man: if he wants to become godlike, it doesn't matter how he gets there, provided he does. And if man could be means of any one center be able to overbridge the difficulties of getting from earth to a higher level of being, from the standpoint of his own self-development it doesn't matter how he reaches God-- as long as he is there; it's okay. But you see, this assumes that the sole purpose of man is to come a higher being, & that I think is quite contrary to what G. means. G. means that man must be born on earth for a very definite reason, otherwise he wouldn't find himself here. And if for some other reason he would have to be like an angel or like a saint, he

M1069

most likely would not have been born here, but maybe on some other planet or even on the Sun itself. The fact that he is on earth; the fact that he finds himself with 3 centers-- at least, some of them partly developed--; the fact that at the present time he is not harmonious because the centers cannot function independently of each other; the fact that he, in his striving, always strives to have one center interfere with another because that happens to be for the personality a question of equilibrium; that this kind of a state for man is not ideal & can only lead to a harmony by the possible development of certain centers so that they in themselves, having grown up, that they can actually be together with the other 2 in a more or less equal understanding of each other. You can say that again in other words. Physical center is 100% developed, practically. Emotional center is only1/2 way developed, & intellectual center is just about 2%. Again, this is an assumption. I have to start with an assumption that I believe man is not complete, & that work has to be done for his further development, & that man at times will find himself with the potentiality of such development, & that if he realizes such is the case, then it is up to him to find out how to develop it. So now if I want to look at myself from the standpoint of my mind becoming objective to that which is my physical center, then I should understand that whatever should be the result of such an observation should feed me as personality in 3 different ways because I am not interested only to develop my physical center by observing it. The result of this kind of an observation would be that man, under the influence of this accumulation of so-called absolute data, is in a different condition from man who is unconscious; & that the conscious man-- the man who can at least at times be objective even if it is not possible for him to continue it-- that at such a time, man, as a body with its functions, is in a different state. Again I say it is not entirely an assumption because many of these things can be proven for oneself, & you know how sometimes one says that what is in man physically is being loosened up; that which is being digested by the breathing process is digested better; & that which is man as he receives impressions while he is conscious will enable him to develop his intellectual body, Whatever it may be, again I say--& this becomes assump-

M1069

tion-- that if he does that, something starts to develop which he would like to define for himself as a possibility of a development of bodies similar to his physical body, but on a different kind of a plane & of a different kind of a density. I think the assumption is quite logical for that, & if one could conceive of that kind of a possibility, I could also say that if man could have 3 bodies, there would be a very good opportunity for the 3 bodies to be connected in a more harmonious way than at the present time could take place between a full-grown body, half a body & a point. It all depends, now, on what I define as harmony. A haromious man has to be in the first place a man in balance, representing because of his harmony a certain state of peace-- or in any event a chord which is not cacophonic-- which is in the presence of other people able to maintain this; & also then can function in the different directions of himself as expressed by the 3 centers in such a way that that which he is doing, or what he is feeling, or what he is thinking, is appropriate to the condition in which he is at that time. Now this presupposes, of course, that each of these 3 necessary functions as a man should be is under the influence of something that can direct it, & that that something has to be of a different kind of quality than any one of the 3 centers even if they are full-grown into the form of bodies. To what extent, now, we can continue to go on assumptions & in how far it is necessary that assumptions have to be verified, one will only find out by Working. There is no other way, because as long as I keep on theorizing about it, I will keep to my assumptions & they will never be verified enough so that the assumption can change into the reality of an experience. You see that from that it is necessary that one Works. If I continue to believe in the possibility that if man had 3 bodies it would be wonderful--- but if that is all there is to it, that is as far as I get. I keep on thinking that it would be very nice, but I will not be able to present myself as a conscious man unless there is material in me that can make me represent myself as being conscious; & the result would have to be that if I develop then certain things can take place which will give me the 3 requirements of a conscious man. One is, of course, consciousness. The other has to be conscience, & the 3rd one

M1069

must be Work. If that can be the result of an observation process, when I acquire together with that, a certain facility or even a faculty of being impartial, & if I know that living in the moment will free me from the time that I experience with that?? THEN I also know that as a result of this self-observation all 3 centers will be affected, & although you might say it is not simultaneous, it is correlated, & it depends then entirely on the quantity of material that is available at the time of observation when there is a conscious something observing me. How much of that energy, then, will flow into the one, or the 2nd, or the 3rd direction? Again, an assumption is that in the beginning there's something that I'm interested in giving it the possibility of becoming objective as regards myself. For the time being I call it the beginnings of I; ultimately it would have to be an I that is full-grown who can at that time when it is full-grown & mature enough, take responsibility for the behavior, feeling, thinking of myself as personality. This of course is like an aim that I set out on & that I try to work toward. I know, time & time again, having this aim in mind, I only know I will be able to understand more of it when I continue to observe myself, & this has to go on for a long time, & probably as long as man is still developing his consciousness & his conscience. I don't call it simultaneous--I call it acting at the same time, & feeding that what is required for further evolution, properly. That what becomes simultaneous at times is where there is an interchange between the development of an intellectual body & the completion of an emotional one. That I can understand. I can understand also that if there is a possibility of the si-do of physical existence of man loosening up, that then because of that, the functions that arenecessary for his present intellect & his present feeling center are a little bit segregated, & then they flow over into a condition of man in which he becomes primarily interested in his possible evolution. So that way, there is then a relationship between man as he is unconscious, & man who tries to become conscious. In how far, nowthis particular parallellism between intellect & the feeling can continue-- that of course, again, it is logical that if emotional center is finished, then the intellectual center is halfway, & that the further development of intel-

tual center has to take place on its own. Now maybe I don't like that idea. Maybe I want to believe that I can enter into a conscious area through all 3 gates at the same time. As I said before, it is a matter of how much energy is there. If there is a tremendous flow, it can go into one gate & the other & the other in the same way when you have pressure in a water line, you canopen several faucets & all of them can give you water. But if there isn't enough, then it will have to go to that what is most important. It will go in the direction which corresponds to that what is the quality of the material that is produced. For instance, if while under observation my body is now in the state as a result of an emotional disturbance, the kind of energy that becomes available while it is under observation is emotionally tinted; & for that reason, when the possibility of a flow starts, it will flow into the development of Kesdjan body. Whenever under observation my mind is functioning in a certain way--particularly, considering, weighing, pondering of some kind--with an intense wish to formulate certain concepts correctly, that energy which is released when I observe that is not necessary to the same quantity is of course intellectually colored; & as a result, whenever I am in a conscious state, if I can maintain it long enough, that energy will flow into the development of my intellectual body. Whenever I observe myself as that what is bothering me now as an obstacle to observation, & I see in that, that that is caused by my habitual way of behaving unconsciously, that I know that the obstacle which is in my way which opposes it is exactlly that what is a certain tightness of my physical body, not allowing it to be put in different forms or shapes; that I am habitually using my physical body as an expression within very small limits; & that when I try to observe I realize that that is actually preventing me from continuing to be awake--this form of energy will flow into the si-do of the physical body, & it will help me then to realize that, that what is really interfering with the possibility of growth is a tightness of myself as expressed by the si-do. Si-do means that I am-- that I love myself; that I don't want to give up certain things that to; that I feel that if I wanted to give them up, I would be lost. And for that reason, every form of that kind of vanity which is based on the general be-

havior that I now wish to represent, for whatever reason; that then, in that way, I am so closely linked up that that what I believe a necessity for myself--that is exactly in the way of loosening up the bondage-- letting myself go & be free from myself. When I actually could experience that it wouldn't make any difference what my appearance is, but that that which counts is my heart, then I would be loose from it, or I could choose then what I wish to become or be in accordance with what I think is the form that is necessary for my behavior in the surroundings in which I live. Put it on a little different scale: if I make a god of my stomach, I become very much dependent on certain food in a certain way, served to me in certain conditions. If I as a personality am interested in having a surrounding which has to be just so & not different; i.e., if I insist on such cleanliness & such fussiness & such impossibility even considering the moving of a chair-- something which for the maintenance of my household is almost a sin--I am so terribly tied up with the way I think I ought to live that it is practically impossible to have any experience of observation. If, on the other hand, I could, that what is represented by the tightening will help me to loosen myself up. That represents, of course, si-do being understood. You understand now? Forget about simultaneity. Simultaneity applies only when it is a requirement of observation, in order to bring out of memory & out of that what I anticipate something that I can hold onto as an entity which has no particular form, no particular dimension; which is not expressed in any thing I am familiar with as far as earth is concerned, but which belongs, because of its nature, to a different level of being. Although constantly that what I consider a moment or a point is constantly being expressed in the form of a dimension; & because of that it is impossible for me as an ordinary human being with that which is a subjective faculty in my mind or in my feeling center even to conceive of a moment or conceive of a point. At the same time I have to try to teach my mind in some way or other to become familiar with the idea, because otherwise, if I talk about objectivity, it is quite impossible for me to try to understand it. So in order to overbridge this kind of concept which I now consider time in me, I now have to see what it is I consider time in my experience; & then I start to compare it with time

time existing, which, as a flow, as a current, goes through me; & at the moment when I become aware of that, that becomes the moment of my time. But that when it has gone or when it is expected to come, my mind keeps on functioning in the way I now say I think about time coming or time having gone. The the element I call time or time length becomes for me the important part of a registration of a time from beginning to end, from birth to death, or from one point to another as measured in a so-called chronological time with my watch (or the sun) having gone from one place to another while I went from one place to another, or when something happened to me during that length of time. If I understand time that way, i.e, that I as an ordinary human being must consider it as having a certain dimension. I am not talking now about 2nd & 3rd dimensions; it is ? in exactly the same way-- but in any event, if I take only the 1st dimension, that what is for me a point I can conceive of in 2 different ways: one is that there is a point of time which moves; & the moment, then describes the length of a duration. The other is that I see a time length for whatever it is or whatever its length may be, & I try now to telescope it back into one point. The advantage of the 2nd way of looking at it is that when I see a time length of myself, I see part of my life, I see experiences, I see possible developments; & that gives me something that has at least existed & that I believe could extend into the future & could continue to exist. So it gives me a concept for myself in which I know that time has been consumed Now when I try to bring these together into one point, it is fairly easy for me to continue to look at this point as still having in it all the experiences I have had. And all it has meant is to bring it to a point, as it were, condensed, in which then in concentrated form time still remains in existence. But this time is a form of time which is not any longer dependent on the one dimension of time length. In this way I can train my mind to have a little bit of an idea of what would be the experience of a moment. But there is no other way, really, that I train it. I can have an experience of myself as a realization of existence in which I know that I exist, & in which not any of my ordinary functions seem to play a part. This, one also knows as an experience, but as I say it happens to be accidental because I cannot control it, & I cannot bring

about. But when it happens to me, I have the experience of what is for me a point in time. And very many times when that does happen, the realization that in that point everything exists can of course also become an experience. Very often as it is said, a person who faces death & is actually in that state in which it could go one way or the other, looks at his life as if it is unrolled for him from beginning to end. Philosophically speaking, it is a perfectly good concept. There is absolutely no reason why time should be limited to a watch. And when I compare it to my own experience, I know that time as an experience is very flexible, & that there is absolutely no assurance that times will always be equal in length. If that's the case, & it's already flexible, it's a small step to consider that it has become one point. I can also extend it; i,e., I can see my life as an extension; or by enlarging certain time lengths to a much greater distance. This I do when I change movements into a slower rhythm. I also do it when I change my interest. And when I know, I sometimes explain it to myself as "Time is hanging heavy on me", it looks as if time has gone much slower & in reality has gone by the watch in exactly the same way. But it is simply that during that period there was no interest in living; & because of that there was no way by which this time that I experience was, you might say, consumed. Well, whatever it is that happens to one when one experiences this question of time in one form or other, it is as if there was a flow of that through oneself from the beginning of birth & until one dies; & that is my own time because it is no one else's. And that my time dies with me because I die. For that reason, Gurdjieff calls it "Unique"; belonging to my subjectivity. It is subjectivity par excellence. It is subjectivity I cannot share with anyone else; & it must be a unique experience of me only; & each person has for himself his own time, & even if he tries to describe it, he has to use a watch in order to compare it. What would happen in objective time is a different thing. In the first place I would be free from time lengths in whatever form they may be. I would also be free--not only from time lengths, but I would be free from space dimensions. And whenever a moment or a point for me is experienced, at that moment, since there is no distinction in either the dimension according to space or according to time, then there is a pos-

sibility that each point or each moment is equal to someone else's point or moment. The language, objectively, is the kind of a language in which there is no distinction any more of what we at the present time try to hang onto. And that whenever a person living objectively experiences, that is equal & is on the same basis of understanding as anyone else being objective; & then whatever made man for whatever he is does not exist. There are no arguments, there are no formulations, there are no words, there are no descriptions. There is nothing that is habitual because at that particular level this form of objectivity will allow already a certain form (I'm sorry I have to use for word "form")-- a certain form of beginning of infinity. Will we let it go now? Sometimes it feels like someone has something by the tail & keeps swinging it around... All right. What other questions?

Q. When I was listening to the music last Thursday night, I was very strongly affected by it & there were a few moments...

A. A little slower, darling (okay, interjected)...yeah..not in such a hurry.

Q. ....for a few moments something seemed to make a good deal of emotional sense & I was left with a very strong desire to be present to myself all the times What I'd like to know is how to keep that feeling alive, & how to keep...

A. It's very difficult, because when it happens you are affected by some form of impressions or some form of energies which you might say are floating around or at least are sent out, & which you receive, & that the resulting state in which you find yourself is of course a direct result of that which affected you. The memory of that never will be the same as the exact experience, but it is possible, you see, that when one is affected by certain influences, there is a relationship between the state in which one is & the quantity of that kind of material which has that kind of influence. Now later on in memory, that influence is less, but still has the similar kind of a quality, particularly when it was . And for that reason, if I wish to be affected by the smaller quantity of energy, I have to put myselfin a lower scale of, you might call it, "being"; a lower scale of activity. Whenever I have the thought I remember how a certain situation was-- let's say it was lovely or beautiful-- my ordinary state will not allow

that to have any particular effect; but if I relax & reduce my state, if I relax my self with my pulse being reduced to the smallest quantity, as slow as possible; ordinary feelings to be taken away from me, my body to be relaxed physically-- then you might say I lower my state of living; & because of that, the effect of that what is represented by the memory of a memorable event may then at such a time affect me. You can try that. Do you understand what I mean? If one is at this level, I am affected; almost I might say, regardless of how I was, I am affected. The memory represents this level, it's not as strong. I have to reduce myself to match this level. At that time I can be . Don't forget, music is a language. It surely is different from words. It is a rate of vibration; sound is a rate of vibration, sound as expressed in words is a rate of vibration. So the words themselves are not the ones that is the form, but that what makes a word is that what is the sound what produces the word. Only I limit it a little bit more when I put it in the form of a word, & if I could keep it simply as a sound, as a rate of vibration with my vocal cords, it need not be in the form of a word. So the effect of music as sound can be very similar to the effect of a word, particularly when the word has in it a certain content of emotion. That is of course one says the tone of one's voice sometimes can penetrate one, whereas an ordinary intellectual way of stating certain facts actually will never touch you. Now in sounds, as music or in any event as combination of certain rates start to effect you emotionally, it is then the emotion is aroused exactly the same as your eardrumswould be when they hear a word. How does one reproduce in one's mind, when you want to recall that what has happened, when your mind has been affected by a word & it should have become a memory, how do you bring it back? Again, the same-- I say I have forgotten it, let me think about it; oh, be quiet, let me think. I do exactly the same in trying to recall a word by excluding all other different kinds of thoughts in order to give a chance for that what was memory to make itself known again. You see, it is exactly the same way now on an emotional scale, only I'm not so used to it because I am used to use my mind in expressing. If I learn how to use my feelings in expressing by means of letting rates of vibrations, from whichever source they may come, appear &

affect me without being interfered with having to put them in words, then I have a pure form of a communication which is possible on that kind of a level. You remember I have said about how to receive music or how to listen to it. I made reference that evening, I think, to the little story Paul Hertzon which illustrates that to some extent what is or what should be, for a person listening to music-- what should be his state in order to become sufficiently perceptive, or to derive from it a certain benefit. One of the requirements is that one takes the sounds for whatever they are without trying to describe them or place them or analyse them or compare them with what you already have heard, & give it a name. It is very wrong to say that sounds like so & so, that sounds like someone else. As soon as I start doing that, as soon as I start comparing them to things that have already taken place in me, I lose the advantage of receiving it for whatever it is; & as it were, I put it then, by comparing it to something else, into words, & it should not be put into words. Whenever a sound is said, it is already bad enough that it should have to use an instrument to produce it. Almost, you might say, the ideal sound-producing instrument is a vocal cord. There, it is still part of a human being, & it is not necessary to go thru the strings of a piano. But aside from that, if it is possible to receive that kind of-- call it an influence-- in the form of a sound, that that what a human being ought to be is in the first place not classified this or that, but also that it is necessary for him to be relaxed, open; to be able to receive whatever his ears can hear without the classification in his mind, as if he hears a bird sing. No one will try to say that that sounds like Bach. One takes; at most one would say, "that is a nightingale". But very often when you don't know the bird it's much to your advantage because all you hear is a group of beautiful-perhaps a little melody, perhaps something; but in any event you are affected by it without any wish whatsoever to put anything in words. You say "It's beautiful". That's all. This is the case with a person when he wants to listen to music-. To be completely free from any kind of inhibitions; to be open, to let that what can, take place, & to allow it-- to allow it to enter into his brain in which he hears whatever it is at that time that the music represents. Sometimes a certain form of rhythm or a cadence,

or a certain way by which a tone is struck (sometimes distinguishable as intensity) (or volume); sometimes a recognition- because the mind is pretty clever--the recognition of certain rates of vibration which are a little different; also rates of vibration which are mixed with each other in the form of overtones. As far as the mind is concerned, that is probably all it can do. The feeling center, & particularly one's heart, also can be affected by the sounds even if they do enter into one's ear; & the eardrum need not, necessarily, only send it to the brain. Many times it can go over into--& by way of the brain, & by way of the thalamus-- will reach the heart of a person if he is open enough & willing enough to be affected & not be afraid of having emotions start to function in him. This what then is affected is the combination of selves. That what is produced by sounds as sounds together without an individual note, it is the totality in that what is produced by means of a pedal, letting it, you might might say, "sing through", or to catch vibrations at the particular height of the vibrations at the particular height of the vibration by when it is struck again in the same way, it reinforces the effect of the vibration & then enables such a vibration to penetrate further. It's a very important point in how to play-- what one really wants to express with the use of a pedal at the proper time, & not to let it flow over into something it doesn't belong to. Another way by which the feeling is affected is a combination of certain notes which produce sometimes a cacophonic effect. At sometimes a solution of one note into a resolving chord will affect a person in his heart. You see, there is in his heart always the expectancy of what will come next. His classification of course spoils it for him, but his heart is able to anticipate in some way what it might be, & when it is a little different-- sometimes cacophonical, sometimes unexpectedly producing certain things-- his heart then recognises it at that moment & it makes it alive. Those are the 2 things as far as the mind is concerned & as far as the feelithe feeling center is concerned. I simply say it is in the heart because it should be an emotion. That what is pauses between notes, that what is the rhythm as expressed in certain measurements. That what becomes sometimes phraseology--all that is a question of both the mind & the heart. The 3rd form is that that which starts to

vibrate outside of one, as the piano or as a violin or an orchestra can produce of course certain sounds at a distance which are heard & felt & which can physically affect a person. In that way, then, they function as tuning forks; when they are struck, they affect other tuning forks of the same kind of vibration rate-- you know how these experiments take place, you know enough about tuning forks. So that then if a body could become a tuning fork, it would start to vibrate in accordance with the rates of vibration as the source produces. For that of course it has to be extremely sensitive & extremely relaxed, but when it is relaxed, it will start in accordance with the rhythm, & it will start to vibrate in accordance with the sound that is being produced. These are the 3 forms by which a person should be affected, & can be affected when his listens, I would almost say impartially, to music. It is then in the music & can be divided into the 3 parts that affect the 3 parts of a man individually. I say it has to be in the music because the music has to be the totality of all such things as if they, when they are sent over, are one. And when they are produced, they have to be produced as 3; & in the final sounds that has to come out as harmony. So here is the process: a performer or whoever plays has to be 3-fold, & in this 3-foldedness he has to produce by means of his hands, by means of his brain knowing what to play or already you might say hearing it, & by means of his touch introducing that what is his feeling, a certain combination now becoming a sound form & being sent over, in which the 3 separate parts temporarily have merged; & when they are received by that what is audience or a person who is under the influence of it, that in that person at the moment when they are received they can be changed back again into the 3 component parts. This is really how the process should take place. It happens very seldom, but it doesn't mean it's not the way it should be. If it does; if a person is affected, you might say in this 3-fold manner, the experience of that person is of course in the first place a 3-fold one, & will produce in a person--& only in the state when he is awake--an entity in which the 3 have become one. The final result then is that what this man experiences, although that what is 3-foldness is not at all of a similar kind--it is not all likeable or not likeable, it is not all descriptive, it is not all a rate of vibration in the same

manner. It may be among them as 3-foldness within the recipient, quite opposite factors; but the final result will be a certain form of harmony, particularly, as I say, when the person is awake; & then, that what is produced is a state of being.....

Tape blurs off & discontinues at this point.